Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/576,676	HARCHOL-BALTER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Daniel J. Ryman	2616

All Participants:

Status of Application: *Allowance*

(1) *Daniel J. Ryman*.

(3) _____.

(2) *Ira V. Heffan*.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: *14 June 2007*

Time: *8:30 am*

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant   ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes   ☒ No
If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
NA

Claims discussed:
NA

Prior art documents discussed:
NA

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner indicated to Applicant that the case was in condition for allowance, except for typographical issues and 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraph, issues. With respect to the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, issues, in claim 1, the preamble of the claim states that the method is performed by each cooperating node while step (a) requires "storing in each cooperating node. . ." The specification never discloses that each node stores cooperating node information available to another node in the another node. Thus, Examiner suggested changing "storing in each cooperating node" to "storing in that cooperating node". With respect to 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, issues, in claims 1 and 15, Examiner suggested changing the phrase "the first cooperating node" to "that cooperating node" since "the first cooperating node" implies that when a given node implements the method it will implement the method through a "first node" rather than implementing the method in the given node. Examiner also suggested changed all instances of "the first node" to "that node" in the dependent claims. Further, with respect to the typographical issues, in claim 1, Applicant amended some of the phrases "the cooperating node information" to "the stored cooperating node information"; however, Applicant failed to change all instances of this phrase. Therefore, Examiner suggested amending the remaining instances of "the cooperating node information" to "the stored cooperating node information." Additionally, Examiner suggested changing, in the last line of claim 1, the phrase "whereby cooperating nodes in the network are discovered" to "whereby all cooperating nodes in the network are discovered" since it appears that the phrase "all" was inadvertently deleted. Cf. Amendment filed 1/26/2006 which contains the word "all" and Amendment filed 8/15/2006 which does not contain the word "all." Finally, Examiner suggested changing the wording of the preamble of the independent claims for purposes of clarity. Applicant agreed with these proposed changes and agreed that Examiner should make the changes through an Examiner's Amendment..